

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 18-34 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant amends Claim 32.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 18-31 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okura et al. (JP 2000-012377). Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okura et al. in view of Kitamura (U.S. 2002/0093415).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 32-34.

Claim 32 has been amended to recite:

An electronic component comprising:
conductive pattern layers; and
insulating layers which are alternately arranged with the conductive pattern layers to form a laminate in which the conductive pattern layers are integrally laminated to each other; wherein
in at least one of the conductive pattern layers, at least one floating dummy pattern which is not electrically connected to a corresponding conductive pattern is disposed in a region between an end surface of said at least one of the conductive pattern layers and the conductive pattern at an interval therefrom so as not to be exposed at the end surface of said at least one of the conductive pattern layers; and
no conductive patterns are disposed between one end surface of each of the insulating layers and the at least one floating dummy pattern. (emphasis added)

The Examiner alleged that Okura et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's Claim 32, including the feature of "no conductive patterns are disposed between the end surface of said at least one of the conductive pattern layers and the at least one floating dummy pattern." Particularly, the Examiner alleged, "as shown in drawing 7, no conductive patterns are disposed between the end surface of said at least one of the conductive pattern layers and the at least one floating dummy pattern, that is, there is no conductive pattern located between the end surface of electrode A in the

upper conductive pattern layer and adjacent floating dummy pattern 52c.”

Applicant’s Claim 32 has been amended to recite the feature of “no conductive patterns are disposed between one end surface of each of the insulating layers and the at least one floating dummy pattern.” Support for this features is found, for example, in paragraphs [0051] to [0054] of Applicant’s originally filed Substitute Specification and in Figs. 3A to 4 of Applicant’s originally filed drawings.

As shown in Fig. 7 of Okura et al., the electrode layer A, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the conductive pattern layers recited in Applicant’s Claim 32, includes an electrode 52c, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the at least one floating dummy pattern recited in Applicant’s Claim 32, that is disposed between conductive patterns 52a and 52b. As a result, as clearly show in Fig. 7 of Okura et al., the electrode 52c is arranged such that one of the conductive patterns 52a, 52b is disposed between each end surface of the insulating layers 53 and the electrode 52c. Okura et al. fails to teach or suggest any conductive pattern layer that includes a conductive pattern (i.e., any floating dummy pattern) that is not exposed at an end surface of the conductive pattern layers that is arranged such that no conductive patterns are disposed between the end surface of the insulating layers 53 and the floating dummy pattern.

Thus, Okura et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of “no conductive patterns are disposed between one end surface of each of the insulating layers and the at least one floating dummy pattern” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 32.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okura et al.

The Examiner relied upon Kitamura to allegedly cure deficiencies of Okura et al. However, Kitamura fails to teach or suggest the feature of “no conductive patterns are disposed between one end surface of each of the insulating layers and the at least one floating dummy pattern” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 32. Thus, Kitamura clearly fails to cure the deficiencies of Okura et al. described above.

Application No. 10/599,368
September 9, 2009
Reply to the Office Action dated June 10, 2009
Page 11 of 11

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Okura et al. and Kitamura, applied alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claim 32.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 32 is allowable. Claims 33 and 34 depend upon Claim 32, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 32 is allowable. Claims 18-31 are allowable over the prior art of record, as indicated by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 9, 2009

/Christopher A. Bennett, #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710